

The Effectiveness of Sedentary Behaviour Interventions for Reducing Body Mass Index in Children and Adolescents: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Liane B. Azevedo^{1*}; Jonathan Ling²; Istvan Soos³; Shannon Robalino⁴; Louisa Ells¹

¹ ¹Health and Social Care Institute, Teesside University, Middlesbrough, UK

² Department of Pharmacy Health and Well-being, University of Sunderland, Sunderland, UK

³ Department of Sports and Exercise Sciences, University of Sunderland, UK

⁴ Institute of Health and Society, Newcastle University, Newcastle, UK

* Corresponding author:

Liane B. Azevedo

Health and Social Care Institute, Teesside University, Middlesbrough, UK

Email: l.azevedo@tees.ac.uk

Telephone: +44 (0)1642 342988

Keywords: screen viewing, obesity, treatment, prevention

Running title: Sedentary behaviour interventions and BMI

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank Prof. Greg Atkinson (GA) and Dr. Nazile Iqbal (NI) for their support on article screening. This study was partially funded by Fuse- The Centre for Translational Research in Public Health and Teesside University.

Conflict of interest: Dr Louisa Ells is seconded to Public Health England as a specialist obesity advisor. There are no other conflicts of interest.

Abstract

Intervention studies have been undertaken to reduce sedentary behaviour (SB), and thereby potentially ameliorate unhealthy weight gain in children and adolescents. We synthesised evidence and quantified the effects of SB interventions (single or multiple components) on body mass index (BMI) or BMI z-score in this population.

Publications up to March 2015 were located through electronic searches. Inclusion criteria were interventions targeting SB in children that had a control group and objective measures of weight and height. Mean change in BMI or BMI z-score from baseline to post-intervention were quantified for intervention and control groups and meta-analysed using a random effects model. The pooled mean reduction in BMI and BMI z-score was significant but very small (standardized mean difference [SMD] = -0.060, 95% confidence interval [CI] -0.098 to -0.022). However, the pooled estimate was substantially greater for an overweight or obese population (SMD = -0.255, 95% CI -0.400 to -0.109). Multicomponent interventions (SB and other behaviours) delivered to children from 5 to 12 years old in a non-educational setting appear to favour BMI reduction. In summary, SB interventions are associated with very small improvement in BMI in mixed-weight populations. However, SB interventions should be part of multicomponent interventions for treating obese children.

Introduction

Worldwide, 42 million children under the age of five are overweight or obese (1). Although the prevalence rates of obesity in developing countries appears to have leveled (2;3), current rates remain high and rates in developing countries continue to rise (4).

Overweight and obesity during childhood has been associated with insulin resistance and type II diabetes (5), and can lead to metabolic syndrome which also includes dyslipidemia and hypertension (6). There is evidence of a high degree of BMI tracking across different age groups (<10 years old to ≥ 18 years old) (7), and there is moderate evidence to suggest that overweight and obese youths will become overweight adults (8), indicating that there is a low probability of spontaneous weight loss through life if individuals do not receive treatment.

Several interventions have been developed for weight management during childhood including lifestyle interventions (e.g. diet and physical activity) (9) and pharmacological interventions (10). There is some evidence to support that sedentary behaviour (i.e. television viewing) is associated with obesity in children (11-13). However, some argue that there is still mixed evidence for a relationship between sedentary behavior and overweight or obesity, and the association might be small and not clinically relevant (14;15). Nevertheless, several behavioral interventions have included sedentary behaviour in an attempt to target the wide range of factors that are associated with energy balance (16).

Three previous meta-analyses have examined the effect of sedentary behaviour interventions on body mass index (BMI) (17-19). The first review included 6 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and found no significant difference in mean BMI change (-0.10 kg/m^2 , -0.28 to -0.09) (17). Van Grieken et al. (2012) retrieved 14 controlled trial studies and found a significant difference on post-intervention change in BMI (-0.14 kg/m^2 , CI: -0.23 to -0.05). Finally, the most recent meta-analysis with 25 RCTs, found a small significant effect of sedentary behaviour intervention on BMI reduction (Hedge's $g = -0.073$, $p = 0.021$) (19).

Although several meta-analyses have been conducted in this field, the cut-off date for the latest review (19) was July 2012 and 21 new studies have been published since then. Furthermore, we found 19 articles dated before July 2012 which were not included in previous reviews, perhaps due to different inclusion or exclusion criteria: RCTs only (17;19), excluded studies with overweight and obese participants (18); excluded studies in which BMI was adjusted for covariates (19).

Although previous studies (18;19) explored the effect of intervention type (single or multiple behaviour) on BMI reduction, they did not explore the effect of other variables such as age range, weight status (mixed or overweight/obese), duration of intervention, intervention setting and study quality.

Therefore, the aim of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to summarize and compare the effect of interventions that target sedentary behavior (e.g. TV viewing, video gaming) on BMI or BMI z-score in children (0 to 17 years old of any weight status), assessed using either a randomized or non-randomized controlled trial. The secondary aim was to explore if there were subgroup differences according to age, weight status, intervention type, duration, setting, and study quality on intervention outcome (i.e. BMI).

Methods:

We conducted our systematic review using methodological approaches defined in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviewers (20) and reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) criteria (21). An a priori protocol was published in Prospero (registration CRD42013005686) (22).

Study Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria:

Studies were included in this review if they were randomised or non-randomised controlled trials conducted in free living (non-laboratory) settings, and assessed sedentary behaviour (SB) interventions in children aged 0 to 17 years old from all weight status categories. To be classified as a sedentary behaviour intervention, the intervention had to target activities undertaken whilst sitting or lying down, such as

screen-based activities. Studies were included if the SB intervention was delivered as a single (SB only) or multi-component intervention (targeted other behaviours such as physical activity or diet as well as SB). To be included studies must have reported objectively measured weight and height, provided a BMI or BMI z –score, and included a control group that was not exposed to any other type of intervention including sedentary behaviour, physical activity or diet.

We excluded studies which were performed in laboratory settings, had no control groups, targeted active video gaming and defined sedentary behaviour as a failure to meet a physical activity guidelines. Studies were also excluded if they involved children suffering from a critical illness or a secondary or syndromic form of obesity.

Search strategy

The following databases were searched for this study: MEDLINE; Embase, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL); Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews; Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects (DARE); PsycINFO; CINAHL; ERIC and SPORTDiscus. Databases were initially searched in June and July 2013 followed by two update searches – October 2013 and March 2015.

Searches were limited to papers published from 1980 to present and restricted to articles published in English language only. Where available, search filters for study types were applied and can be seen in an example of search strategy (e.g. MEDLINE) in Supplement File 1. Files were imported to EndNote reference management software (version 7, version 4.0; Niles Software) where duplicates were removed.

Titles and abstracts of potentially relevant articles were screened independently by two reviewers (LA, NI); any disagreements were discussed with a third reviewer (GA) until consensus was achieved. Full text copies were obtained after the initial screening and were examined independently for eligibility by the two reviewers (LA, NI). Discrepancies were resolved by discussions and consensus or by consultation with a third reviewer (GA).

Data extraction

Standardized data extraction tables were created. Data extraction was completed by one reviewer (LA) and checked by other reviewers (JL or IS) for accuracy. The following information was extracted by the reviewers: study information (i.e. authors, year); study design; population (i.e. number of children in the intervention and control groups, age and population weight category); intervention (i.e. type, duration, description of the sedentary behaviour intervention); outcome measures (i.e. baseline and follow-up mean and standard deviation of intervention and control groups: BMI or BMI z-score and sedentary behaviour).

Critical Appraisal

Risk of bias was assessed using the Cochrane Collaboration tool for Assessing Risk of Bias (23). Seven domains were scored: sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, selective outcome reporting and 'other' (e.g. bias related to the study design implemented, extreme baseline imbalance).

The seven domains were scored as high, low or unclear and were performed independently by two reviewers (LA and one of JL or IS). Findings were compared and discussed until consensus was achieved. The overall strength of the evidence was determined by the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation systems (GRADE pro 3.6). The assessment was rated as high, moderate, low or very low based on the 5 domains of evidence: risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision, inconsistency and reporting bias.

Data Analysis

Means and standard deviations (SD) of BMI or BMI z-score of baseline and the data point closest to the end of the intervention were used for continuous outcomes. When standard error or standard deviation of the mean difference was not presented this was calculated from the reported data (24) following the guidance of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (20). The standard deviation of change score was calculated as: $SD = \sqrt{SD_b^2 + SD_f^2 - 2 \times r \times SD_b \times SD_f}$, where SD_b is

the standard deviation at baseline and SD_f is the standard deviation at follow-up, r is correlation coefficient between baseline and the follow-up score. We used a correlation coefficient of 0.8 which represents the correlation of BMI after 1 year follow-up in children over 10 years old (7). If studies reported data separately for boys and girls they were entered separately into the meta-analysis and for studies with more than one intervention arm the data were combined using pair-wise comparisons with the control group (20). If studies did not report baseline and follow-up mean and standard deviation for BMI or BMI z-score, the reported mean difference and pooled standard deviation were extracted and used for the analysis.

To be able to compare BMI and BMI-z score in the meta-analysis, the standardised mean difference (SMD) was chosen to summarise the measure for the meta-analysis. If a study reported both measures (BMI and BMI-z score), we opted for the non-standardised BMI data. This approach, which has been used previously (25-27), helped to increase the number of studies included in the meta-analysis and increase the statistical power to detect a treatment effect. Effect sizes were corrected for bias by transforming the standardized mean difference to Hedge's g before analysis. Effect sizes were determined as: <0.2 = very small; ≥ 0.2 to < 0.5 = small effect; ≥ 0.5 to <0.8 = medium effect; ≥ 0.8 = large effect (28).

We used Comprehensive Meta Analysis version 3.0 (Biostat, USA) for effect size synthesis and subgroup analyses. A random effects model was used to derive a pooled estimate of the effect of sedentary behavior intervention on SMD. Between-study heterogeneity was quantified using I -square (I^2) statistics. Subgroup analyses using mixed effects analysis were conducted to examine the impact of age (0 to 5 years; 5 to 12 years; 12 to 17 years); population weight status (overweight/obese; mixed weight); intervention type (sedentary behaviour, sedentary behaviour and physical activity, sedentary behaviour and other behaviours other than only physical activity); setting (educational, non-educational, combined); duration (≥ 6 months, < 6 months) and study quality (low risk of bias, high risk of bias and unclear) on intervention effectiveness to reduce BMI (SMD).

A second meta-analysis was also conducted for studies which reported BMI data and a subgroup analyses were performed for studies which presented BMI data in an overweight/obese population.

Results

Systematic Review

The searches yielded a total of 7,607 papers of which 67 met the inclusion criteria (Figure 1). Supplement file 2 summarizes the main characteristics and findings of 67 eligible studies. Sixty-one studies conducted an RCT or a cluster RCT and six were non-randomised controlled trials. Seventeen studies were conducted with preschool children (0 to 5 years old), 35 with children (5 to 12 years old) and 15 with adolescents (12 to 17 years old). Eighteen studies were conducted in an exclusively overweight population and 49 studies were conducted in a mixed weight population. The majority of the interventions (N=39) were less than 6 months in duration. Six interventions only targeted sedentary behaviour, 10 interventions targeted exclusively sedentary behaviour and physical activity and 51 interventions targeted sedentary behaviour alongside other behaviour(s) including: diet, sleep, breastfeeding and motor skills. Twenty-three studies were delivered in an educational setting (e.g. school), 25 in a non-educational setting (e.g. home, community, primary care setting) and 19 were delivered in a combined setting (educational and non-educational). The majority reported BMI data (N=51), with the remainder only reporting the data in BMI z-score (N=16) applying different growth chart references (e.g. CDC, WHO, UK 90 and IOTF).

Figure 1 here

Thirty-two studies were considered to have a low risk of bias, 22 were high risk of bias and 13 were unclear (Supplement File 3). Figure 2 reports the aggregated risk of bias of studies using the Cochrane Effective Practice and Organization of Care risk-of-bias tool for randomized controlled trials (23), non-randomized controlled trials, and controlled before-after studies.

Figure 2 here

Nineteen studies reported significant decrease in BMI or BMI z-score (29-47). However, one of these studies reported a significant difference in girls but not in boys (35). From these studies, the majority (N=13) were performed with children (5 to 12 years old) (29;31-35;37-40;42;47). Eight were performed in an overweight population (31;32;34;37;39;41;43;47) while 11 were performed in a mixed weight population (29;30;33;35;36;38;40;42;44-46). Most of the studies which reported significant decreases (N=13) targeted 3 behaviours (29;30;32;33;36;37;39;41-43;45;46;48) which were predominately sedentary behaviour, physical activity and diet (29;30;32;33;37;39;41;43;45;46;48). Nine of the successful interventions were delivered in a non-educational setting (e.g. home, community or primary care setting) (34;36;37;39;39;41;43;46;47). Ten of these studies which reported significant decreases in BMI or BMI z-score (29;31-34;39;42;44-46) also reported significant decreases in total sedentary behaviour or screen-viewing, while eight studies did not find significant differences in sedentary behaviour (30;36;38;39;41;43;45;47) and two have not reported sedentary behaviour data (35;37). Eight of these studies were considered high risk of bias (29;32-34;37;38;45), six were low risk of bias (34;36;40-42;46) and five studies were unclear (29;31;35;43;47).

Meta-analysis

Figure 3 and Table 1 show the pooled standardised mean difference (SMD) between intervention and control groups. There was a very small (<0.2) but statistically significant difference in favour of the intervention group (SMD - 0.060, 95% CI - 0.098 to -0.022). There was evidence of moderate heterogeneity between studies ($I^2 = 50\%$, $p < 0.001$). Furthermore, the asymmetrical funnel plot (Supplement File 4) and results from Egger's test (intercept = -0.771, $p < 0.05$) show that there was publication bias. The quality of the evidence for the pooled SMD outcome was rated as moderate and is summarized in Table 2.

Figure 3 and Table 1 and 2 here

Fifty-one studies included in the meta-analysis measured the change in BMI. There was a small but significant change favouring the intervention for change in BMI (Table 1). A subgroup analysis revealed a mean BMI difference of -0.493 kg/m^2 (95%

CI -0.681 to -0.304) for the studies which targeted overweight or obese populations and -0.029 kg/m² (95% CI -0.093 to 0.035) for studies with mixed weight populations.

Table 3 shows that interventions were significant when delivered to children but not when delivered to pre-school children or adolescents. Likewise, multicomponent interventions (interventions that target sedentary behaviour plus other behaviours rather than only PA) had significantly lowered BMI or BMI z –score compared with controls, whereas single behaviour interventions and interventions that included only sedentary behaviour and physical activity showed no differences. Similarly interventions in non-educational settings led to significant differences compared to controls, while interventions delivered in an educational setting or combined settings showed no difference. Furthermore, only studies with high risk of bias were statistically significant, while studies with low risk of bias and unclear risk of bias were not significant. The SMD was also statistically different between both short (<6 months) and long term (>6 months) interventions.

Table 3 here

Discussion

This study found moderate quality of evidence that sedentary behaviour interventions are associated with statistically significant but very small improvements in BMI and BMI z-score (SMD data). The reduction in SMD and BMI was greater in an overweight population and likely to be clinically significant at a population level. Likewise, interventions appear to be more effective when implemented in children, as a multicomponent intervention and delivered in a non-educational setting.

There have been a number of studies which explored the minimum clinical important difference (MCID) on BMI z-score to promote health benefits in overweight children (48-53). Some studies reported that a minimum change of 0.5 BMI z-score would be required to improve insulin sensitivity and resistance and atherogenic profile (48;49), while others reported that a minimum change in BMI z-score of 0.25 is required for improvement in cardiometabolic risk factors (50). However, others demonstrated that even a modest decrease of 0.15 BMI z-score (53) or less than 0.1 BMI z-score (51) is

accompanied by significant improvements in health measures. Finally, one study with overweight children reported that changes in weight between -7.55 kg to +3.9 kg were sufficient for an overweight or obese child to achieve a healthy weight after 1 year (52). Despite the variation in estimates of the MCID for BMI to improve health measures in children, previous systematic reviews (19;54) including a previous meta-analysis on sedentary behaviour interventions (19) have used the MCID of 0.25 BMI z-score defined by Ford et al. (50) as the point of reference. Thus, this was also the choice for this meta-analysis.

If BMI z –score defined by Ford et al. (50) is converted to SMD the value would be equivalent to -0.86 (mean change of -0.36 and standard deviation of 0.42). Therefore, to reach clinical significance the effect size of this meta-analysis would need to be very large >0.9 (28). The SMD of this meta-analysis was very low for a mixed weight population (-0.06, 95% CI: -0.098 to -0.022) but increased considerably for an overweight population (-0.255, 95% CI: -0.40 to -0.11). Although this is unlikely to be clinically significant at an individual level, it may produce tangible health benefits for treatment of an overweight and obese population. It is important to note that the SMD results derived from Ford et al. (50) were from a very small population (N=20) of severely obese children (BMI z-score = 3.23 ± 0.49). Likewise, although the effect size of this meta-analysis was small for an overweight population it may still have public health impact at population level. It has been previously argued (55) that controlling health risk at a population level, as opposed as individual-based (also known as high-risk) can be more effective to shift population health outcomes positively.

The large difference in effect size between mixed weight and overweight populations observed in this study was also seen in a comprehensive meta-analysis and systematic review on behaviour interventions to treat (56) or prevent (25) overweight in children and young people. According to the latest reviews when the meta-analysis only included studies with overweight children or youth (BMI $> 85^{\text{th}}$ percentile) the overall SMD was -0.54 (95%CI: -0.73 to -0.36) (56), while for studies with normal weight or mixed weight population the SMD was -0.07 (95%CI: -0.10 to -0.03) (25).

The mechanisms by which sedentary behaviour might affect BMI in an overweight population could be related to displacement of physical activity (57), reduction of total energy expenditure (58), increased general dietary intake (59;60) or of sugar-sweetened beverages (61). There are disagreements in the literature on whether physical activity displaces sedentary behaviour. A recent meta-analysis (62) found a negative but weak association between sedentary behaviour and physical activity in children and adolescents, and the authors concluded that these behaviours do not displace each other. However, other cross-national investigations with school-age children found a negative association between the two behaviours that appeared to be stronger in countries where levels of physical activity are particularly high (57). On the other hand, the evidence related to the association of sedentary behaviour and diet behaviour has strengthened in recent years. A recent updated systematic review found a clear trend towards an association between higher levels of sedentary behaviour, especially TV viewing, with an unhealthy diet (e.g. lower fruit and vegetable intake and greater consumption of energy-dense snacks and sugar sweetened beverages) (63), although this association was less clear in an adult population. Finally, another recent systematic review revealed that TV exposure is related to an increase in energy intake rather than a change in physical activity (64).

Another important finding of our study was that interventions appeared to be more effective in children rather than preschool children or adolescents. This contradicts with previous findings from a meta-analysis on prevention and treatment of overweight and obesity which found no differences between age groups (25;56).

Likewise, our study found that multicomponent interventions (sedentary behaviour and other behaviours rather than only physical activity) and interventions which were delivered in non-educational settings appeared to be more effective in reducing BMI. Conversely, interventions which targeted only SB or SB and PA and in an educational or in combined settings did not change BMI significantly.

Previous sedentary behaviour reviews which looked to the effect of single (SB only) versus multiple behaviour interventions have not found statistically significant differences between these (19;65). This is supported by two recent meta-analyses on treatment and prevention of overweight and obesity which did not find significant

differences between single and multiple behaviour interventions (25;56). However, other reviews suggested that multiple behaviour interventions (physical activity and diet) might be more successful than single behaviours at preventing obesity (9;66). A synthesis of meta-analyses and reviews comparing exclusively single and multiple behaviour interventions in adults found that although single behaviour interventions were more effective at changing behaviour, multiple behaviour interventions are more effective at promoting weight loss (67). However, it is important to note that only six studies in our meta-analysis targeted only sedentary behaviour suggesting that more interventions are necessary to clarify this question. Likewise, we also found that studies that target only sedentary behaviour and physical activity do not change BMI, suggesting that a third behaviour (i.e. diet) should be included to promote significant weight changes.

Another important finding of this study was that sedentary behaviour interventions delivered in a non-educational setting (e.g. home, community or primary care) appeared to be more effective than interventions delivered in an educational setting (e.g. school) or combined settings (Table 3, Supplement File 2). Although 23 studies of our meta-analysis sample were delivered in educational settings only 5 showed significant improvements in BMI or BMI z-score. Nevertheless, 10 of the 25 studies delivered in non-educational settings showed significant improvements in BMI or BMI z-score. Although this has not been investigated in previous sedentary behaviour systematic reviews, a recent systematic review (68) which examined the effect of parental influences on screen time in young children (<6 years old) found moderate evidence that parental self-efficacy and parents' own screen time was associated with children's screen time. Likewise, another systematic review found that in fact the level of parental involvement rather than the setting is important to determine the sedentary behaviour intervention success (64). Parental involvement has not been explored in our review but it is expected that interventions delivered at home, community or primary care would have greater involvement of parents rather than the school or nursery environment which would require a deeper involvement of teachers and carers.

The effect size of this review is similar to previous work which compared the effect of sedentary behaviour on BMI (17-19). Although Wahi et al. (17) did not find a

significant difference in the mean difference (-0.10 kg/m^2 , 95%CI: -0.28 to 0.09), this might be due to the small number of studies included in their sample ($N=6$). Both, Van Grieken et al. (18) and Liao et al. (19) found effect size differences that were statistically significant and very similar to this study for a mixed-weight population. However, compared to other meta-analysis which included studies with mixed weight and overweight populations, the effect size found in this study for an overweight population was substantially higher in BMI units (Wahi et al: -0.10 kg/m^2 , CI: -0.28 to -0.09 ; this study: -0.493 kg/m^2 , CI: -0.681 to -0.304) or standardised mean difference (Liao et al. Hedge's g : -0.073 , CI: -0.14 to -0.01 ; this study SMD : -0.255 , CI: -0.400 to -0.109).

Strengths of this meta-analysis include: the number of studies, subgroup analyses, grading of quality of evidence and strength of recommendations and comparison with MCID reported in the literature. However, it also has some limitations as subgroup analysis revealed that statistical significance was only seen in studies with high-risk of bias and no significance was seen in studies with low-risk of bias. Finally, there were a limited number of studies which used sedentary behaviour as the only targeted behaviour.

Conclusion

Sedentary behaviour interventions have been undertaken in isolation or in combination with other behaviours to prevent or treat overweight and obesity in children. The results of this systematic review and meta-analysis indicate that sedentary behaviour interventions are associated with a very small and clinically irrelevant effect on BMI or BMI z-score when applied to the general population or normal weight population. However, the effect of sedentary behaviour interventions on BMI might be clinically effective at population level for children who are overweight or obese. This suggests that sedentary behaviour should be targeted in interventions to treat overweight or obese children. Furthermore, the impact of the interventions appeared to improve when they were delivered to children (5 to 12 years old), implemented with other behaviours (e.g. diet) and in a non-educational setting. However, a large number of high quality studies and studies targeting only sedentary behaviour are required to clarify these findings further.

Table 1: Effect of sedentary behaviour intervention in BMI and BMI z-score.

| Group or Subgroup | Meta-analysis (95%CI) | Heterogeneity | p value | Number of studies (total sample size) |
|---|------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|--|
| Overall change (SMD) | -0.060 (-0.098 to -0.022) | 50% | <0.001 | 71 (N=29,650) |
| Overall change BMI (kg/m ²) | -0.158 (-0.238 to -0.077) | 88% | <0.001 | 51 (N=18,012) |

SMD = standardised mean difference

Table 2: GRADE evidence profile for the effect of sedentary behaviour interventions on BMI.

| Quality assessment | | | | | | | No of participants | | Effect size (95% CI) | Quality | Importance |
|--------------------|----------|----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--|--------------------|---------|---------------------------|------------------|------------|
| No of Studies | Design | Risk of bias | Inconsistency | Indirectness | Imprecision | Other considerations | Intervention | Control | | | |
| 67 | 91% RCTs | Serious ¹ | No serious inconsistency | No serious indirectness | No serious imprecision | Reporting bias ² dose response gradient | 15,369 | 14,281 | -0.060 (-0.098 to -0.022) | ⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE | IMPORTANT |

¹ Twenty-three out of 67 studies were considered high risk of bias. Furthermore, results from the meta-analysis show that the effect size were only significant for studies with high-risk of bias.

² Although there was a comprehensive search conducted, the grey literature was not searched and there were language restrictions. Furthermore, there was evidence of funnel plot asymmetry and discrepancies in findings between published and unpublished trial.

Table 3. Subgroup analysis of the effect of sedentary behaviour intervention on BMI or BMIz-score. Meta-analysis data presented as SMD.

| Subgroup | Meta-analysis (95%CI) | Heterogeneity | Within group differences p value | Number of studies (entries) |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Age group (year) | | | | |
| 0-5 | -0.057 (-0.149 to 0.036) | 68% | NS | 17 |
| 5- 12 | -0.077 (-0.133 to - 0.022) | 42% | <0.006 | 38 |
| 12-17 | -0.037 (-0.094 to 0.020) | 37% | NS | 16 |
| Weight status | | | | |
| Overweight or obese | -0.255 (-0.400 to - 0.109) | 52% | 0.001 | 18 |
| Mixed weight | -0.037 (-0.073 to - 0.001) | 45% | 0.044 | 53 |
| Intervention | | | | |
| SB | -0.166 (-0.334 to - 0.001) | 0% | NS | 6 |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----|--------|----|
| SB + PA | -0.075 (-0.203 to 0.054) | 47% | NS | 11 |
| SB + other behaviours | -0.054 (-0.096 to -0.012) | 54% | <0.05 | 54 |
| Setting | | | | |
| Educational | -0.032 (-0.073 to 0.008) | 16% | NS | 27 |
| Non-educational | -0.211 (-0.328 to -0.094) | 67% | <0.001 | 25 |
| Combined | -0.025 (-0.077 to 0.026) | 36% | NS | 19 |
| Duration | | | | |
| ≤ 6 months | -0.079 (-0.150 to -0.009) | 53% | 0.027 | 41 |
| > 6 months | -0.051 (-0.093 to -0.009) | 47% | 0.018 | 30 |
| Risk of Bias | | | | |
| Low risk of bias | -0.026 (-0.060 to 0.009) | 0% | NS | 33 |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------------------|-----|-------|----|
| High risk of bias | -0.113 (-0.194 to -0.032) | 67% | 0.006 | 23 |
| Unclear risk of bias | -0.065 (-0.172 to 0.042) | 70% | NS | 15 |

References

1. de OM, Blossner M, Borghi E. Global prevalence and trends of overweight and obesity among preschool children. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2010; **92**:1257-1264.
2. Ogden CL, Carroll MD, Kit BK, Flegal KM. Prevalence of childhood and adult obesity in the United States, 2011-2012. *JAMA* 2014; **311**:806-814.
3. van Jaarsveld CH, Gulliford MC. Childhood obesity trends from primary care electronic health records in England between 1994 and 2013: population-based cohort study. *Arch Dis Child* 2015; **100**:214-219.
4. Gupta N, Goel K, Shah P, Misra A. Childhood obesity in developing countries: epidemiology, determinants, and prevention. *Endocr Rev* 2012; **33**:48-70.
5. Hannon TS, Rao G, Arslanian SA. Childhood obesity and type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Pediatrics* 2005; **116**:473-480.
6. Kohen-Avramoglu R, Theriault A, Adeli K. Emergence of the metabolic syndrome in childhood: an epidemiological overview and mechanistic link to dyslipidemia. *Clin Biochem* 2003; **36**:413-420.
7. Bayer O, Kruger H, von KR, Toschke AM. Factors associated with tracking of BMI: a meta-regression analysis on BMI tracking. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2011; **19**:1069-1076.
8. Singh AS, Mulder C, Twisk JW, van MW, Chinapaw MJ. Tracking of childhood overweight into adulthood: a systematic review of the literature. *Obes Rev* 2008; **9**:474-488.
9. Brown T, Summerbell C. Systematic review of school-based interventions that focus on changing dietary intake and physical activity levels to prevent childhood obesity: an update to the obesity guidance produced by the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. *Obes Rev* 2009; **10**:110-141.
10. Harskamp-van Ginkel MW, Hill KD, Becker K *et al.* Drug Dosing and Pharmacokinetics in Children With Obesity: A Systematic Review. *JAMA Pediatr* 2015; **169**:678-685.
11. Rey-Lopez JP, Vicente-Rodriguez G, Biosca M, Moreno LA. Sedentary behaviour and obesity development in children and adolescents. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis* 2008; **18**:242-251.
12. te Velde SJ, van NF, Uijtdewilligen L *et al.* Energy balance-related behaviours associated with overweight and obesity in preschool children: a systematic review of prospective studies. *Obes Rev* 2012; **13**:56-74.
13. Tremblay MS, Leblanc AG, Kho ME *et al.* Systematic review of sedentary behaviour and health indicators in school-aged children and youth. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2011; **8**:98.

14. Marshall SJ, Biddle SJ, Gorely T, Cameron N, Murdey I. Relationships between media use, body fatness and physical activity in children and youth: a meta-analysis. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord* 2004; **28**:1238-1246.
15. Pate RR, O'Neill JR, Liese AD *et al.* Factors associated with development of excessive fatness in children and adolescents: a review of prospective studies. *Obes Rev* 2013; **14**:645-658.
16. Huang TT, Glass TA. Transforming research strategies for understanding and preventing obesity. *JAMA* 2008; **300**:1811-1813.
17. Wahi G, Parkin PC, Beyene J, Uleryk EM, Birken CS. Effectiveness of interventions aimed at reducing screen time in children: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2011; **165**:979-986.
18. Van Grieken A, Ezendam NP, Paulis WD, van der Wouden JC, Raat H. Primary prevention of overweight in children and adolescents: a meta-analysis of the effectiveness of interventions aiming to decrease sedentary behaviour. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2012; **9**:61.
19. Liao Y, Liao J, Durand CP, Dunton GF. Which type of sedentary behaviour intervention is more effective at reducing body mass index in children? A meta-analytic review. *Obes Rev* 2014; **15**:159-168.
20. Higgins JP, Green S. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. 2008.
21. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Int J Surg* 2010; **8**:336-341.
22. Azevedo LB, Atkinson G, Ells L, Iqbal N, Ling J, Soos I, Robalino S. The effect of sedentary behaviour interventions on prevention of overweight and obesity in children: a meta-analysis and meta-regression. *International Prospective Register for Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO)* 2014; CRD42013005686
23. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC *et al.* The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2011; **343**:d5928.
24. Fu R, Vandermeer BW, Shamliyan TA, O'Neil ME, Yazdi F, Fox SH, Morton SC. *Handling Continuous Outcomes in Quantitative Synthesis*. 2008.
25. Peirson L, Fitzpatrick-Lewis D, Morrison K *et al.* Prevention of overweight and obesity in children and youth: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *CMAJ Open* 2015; **3**:E23-E33.
26. Whitlock EP, O'Conner EA, Williams SB, Beil TL, Lutz KW. *Effectiveness of Primary Care Interventions for Weight Management in Children and Adolescents: An Updated, Targeted Systematic Review for the USPSTF*. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); 2010.
27. Waters E, de Silva-Sanigorski A, Hall BJ *et al.* Interventions for preventing obesity in children. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2011; CD001871.

28. Cohen J. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale,NJ: Lawrence Earbaum Associates; 1988.
29. Bacardi-Gascon M, Perez-Morales ME, Jimenez-Cruz A. A six month randomized school intervention and an 18-month follow-up intervention to prevent childhood obesity in Mexican elementary schools. *Nutr Hosp* 2012; **27**:755-762.
30. De Coen, V, De B, I, Vereecken C *et al*. Effects of a 2-year healthy eating and physical activity intervention for 3-6-year-olds in communities of high and low socio-economic status: the POP (Prevention of Overweight among Pre-school and school children) project. *Public Health Nutr* 2012; **15**:1737-1745.
31. Epstein LH, Roemmich JN, Robinson JL *et al*. A randomized trial of the effects of reducing television viewing and computer use on body mass index in young children. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2008; **162**:239-245.
32. Esfarjani F, Khalafi M, Mohammadi F *et al*. Family-based intervention for controlling childhood obesity: an experience among Iranian children. *Int J Prev Med* 2013; **4**:358-365.
33. Economos CD, Hyatt RR, Must A *et al*. Shape Up Somerville two-year results: a community-based environmental change intervention sustains weight reduction in children. *Prev Med* 2013; **57**:322-327.
34. Goldfield GS, Mallory R, Parker T *et al*. Effects of open-loop feedback on physical activity and television viewing in overweight and obese children: a randomized, controlled trial. *Pediatrics* 2006; **118**:e157-e166.
35. Goran MI, Reynolds K. Interactive multimedia for promoting physical activity (IMPACT) in children. *Obes Res* 2005; **13**:762-771.
36. Haines J, McDonald J, O'Brien A *et al*. Healthy Habits, Happy Homes: randomized trial to improve household routines for obesity prevention among preschool-aged children. *JAMA Pediatr* 2013; **167**:1072-1079.
37. Kalarchian MA, Levine MD, Arslanian SA *et al*. Family-based treatment of severe pediatric obesity: randomized, controlled trial. *Pediatrics* 2009; **124**:1060-1068.
38. Lloyd JJ, Wyatt KM, Creanor S. Behavioural and weight status outcomes from an exploratory trial of the Healthy Lifestyles Programme (HeLP): a novel school-based obesity prevention programme. *BMJ Open* 2012; **2**.
39. Nemet D, Barkan S, Epstein Y, Friedland O, Kowen G, Eliakim A. Short- and long-term beneficial effects of a combined dietary-behavioral-physical activity intervention for the treatment of childhood obesity. *Pediatrics* 2005; **115**:e443-e449.
40. Robinson TN. Reducing children's television viewing to prevent obesity: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 1999; **282**:1561-1567.

41. Saelens BE, Sallis JF, Wilfley DE, Patrick K, Cella JA, Buchta R. Behavioral weight control for overweight adolescents initiated in primary care. *Obes Res* 2002;**10**: 22-32.
42. Salmon J, Ball K, Hume C, Booth M, Crawford D. Outcomes of a group-randomized trial to prevent excess weight gain, reduce screen behaviours and promote physical activity in 10-year-old children: switch-play. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2008; **32**:601-612.
43. Shelton D, Le GK, Norton L, Stanton-Cook S, Morgan J, Masterman P. Randomised controlled trial: A parent-based group education programme for overweight children. *J Paediatr Child Health* 2007; **43**:799-805.
44. Simon C, Schweitzer B, Oujaa M *et al.* Successful overweight prevention in adolescents by increasing physical activity: a 4-year randomized controlled intervention. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2008; **32**:1489-1498.
45. Verbestel V, De C, V, Van WM, Huybrechts I, Maes L, De B, I. Prevention of overweight in children younger than 2 years old: a pilot cluster-randomized controlled trial. *Public Health Nutr* 2014; **17**:1384-1392.
46. Wen LM, Baur LA, Simpson JM, Rissel C, Wardle K, Flood VM. Effectiveness of home based early intervention on children's BMI at age 2: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2012; **344**:e3732.
47. Reinehr T, Schaefer A, Winkel K, Finne E, Toschke AM, Kolip P. An effective lifestyle intervention in overweight children: findings from a randomized controlled trial on "Obeldicks light". *Clin Nutr* 2010; **29**:331-336.
48. Reinehr T, Andler W. Changes in the atherogenic risk factor profile according to degree of weight loss. *Arch Dis Child* 2004; **89**:419-22.
49. Reinehr T, Kiess W, Kapellen T, Andler W. Insulin sensitivity among obese children and adolescents, according to degree of weight loss. *Pediatrics* 2004; **114**:1569-1573.
50. Ford AL, Hunt LP, Cooper A, Shield JP. What reduction in BMI SDS is required in obese adolescents to improve body composition and cardiometabolic health? *Arch Dis Child* 2010; **95**:256-261.
51. Kolsgaard ML, Joner G, Brunborg C, Anderssen SA, Tonstad S, Andersen LF. Reduction in BMI z-score and improvement in cardiometabolic risk factors in obese children and adolescents. The Oslo Adiposity Intervention Study - a hospital/public health nurse combined treatment. *BMC Pediatr* 2011; **11**:47.
52. Goldschmidt AB, Wilfley DE, Paluch RA, Roemmich JN, Epstein LH. Indicated prevention of adult obesity: how much weight change is necessary for normalization of weight status in children? *JAMA Pediatr* 2013; **167**:21-6.
53. Kirk S, Zeller M, Claytor R, Santangelo M, Khoury PR, Daniels SR. The relationship of health outcomes to improvement in BMI in children and adolescents. *Obes Res* 2005; **13**:876-882.

54. Niemeier BS, Hektner JM, Enger KB. Parent participation in weight-related health interventions for children and adolescents: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Prev Med* 2012; **55**:3-13.
55. Rose G. Sick individuals and sick populations. *Int J Epidemiol* 2001; **30**:427-32.
56. Peirson L, Fitzpatrick-Lewis D, Morrison K, Warren R, Usman AM, Raina P. Treatment of overweight and obesity in children and youth: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *CMAJ Open* 2015; **3**:E35-E46.
57. Melkevik O, Torsheim T, Iannotti RJ, Wold B. Is spending time in screen-based sedentary behaviors associated with less physical activity: a cross national investigation. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2010; **7**:46.
58. Deheeger M, Rolland-Cachera MF, Fontvieille AM. Physical activity and body composition in 10 year old French children: linkages with nutritional intake? *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord* 1997; **21**:372-379.
59. Marsh S, Ni MC, Maddison R. The non-advertising effects of screen-based sedentary activities on acute eating behaviours in children, adolescents, and young adults. A systematic review. *Appetite* 2013; **71**:259-773.
60. Must A, Barish EE, Bandini LG. Modifiable risk factors in relation to changes in BMI and fatness: what have we learned from prospective studies of school-aged children? *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2009; **33**:705-15.
61. Mazarello P, V, Hesketh K, O'Malley C *et al*. Determinants of sugar-sweetened beverage consumption in young children: a systematic review. *Obes Rev* 2015; **16**:903-13.
62. Pearson N, Braithwaite RE, Biddle SJ, van Sluijs EM, Atkin AJ. Associations between sedentary behaviour and physical activity in children and adolescents: a meta-analysis. *Obes Rev* 2014; **15**:666-675.
63. Hobbs M, Pearson N, Foster PJ, Biddle SJ. Sedentary behaviour and diet across the lifespan: an updated systematic review. *Br J Sports Med* 2015; **49**:1179-1188.
64. Marsh S, Foley LS, Wilks DC, Maddison R. Family-based interventions for reducing sedentary time in youth: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Obes Rev* 2014; **15**:117-133.
65. van GA, Ezendam NP, Paulis WD, van der Wouden JC, Raat H. Primary prevention of overweight in children and adolescents: a meta-analysis of the effectiveness of interventions aiming to decrease sedentary behaviour. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2012; **9**:61.
66. Sharma M. International school-based interventions for preventing obesity in children. *Obes Rev* 2007; **8**:155-167.
67. Sweet SN, Fortier MS. Improving physical activity and dietary behaviours with single or multiple health behaviour interventions? A synthesis of meta-analyses and reviews. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2010; **7**:1720-1743.

68. Xu H, Wen LM, Rissel C. Associations of parental influences with physical activity and screen time among young children: a systematic review. *J Obes* 2015; **2015**:546925.
69. Andrade S, Lachat C, Ochoa-Aviles A *et al.* A school-based intervention improves physical fitness in Ecuadorian adolescents: a cluster-randomized controlled trial. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2014; **11**:153.
70. Backlund C, Sundelin G, Larsson C. Effects of a 2-year lifestyle intervention on physical activity in overweight and obese children. *Advances in physiotherapy* 2011; **13**:97-109.
71. Birken CS, Maguire J, Mekky M *et al.* Office-based randomized controlled trial to reduce screen time in preschool children. *Pediatrics* 2012; **130**:1110-1115.
72. Breslin G, Brennan D, Rafferty R, Gallagher AM, Hanna D. The effect of a healthy lifestyle programme on 8-9 year olds from social disadvantage. *Arch Dis Child* 2012; **97**:618-624.
73. Campbell KJ, Lioret S, McNaughton SA *et al.* A parent-focused intervention to reduce infant obesity risk behaviors: a randomized trial. *Pediatrics* 2013; **131**:652-660.
74. Dennison BA, Russo TJ, Burdick PA, Jenkins PL. An intervention to reduce television viewing by preschool children. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2004; **158**:170-176.
75. Dziewaltowski DA, Rosenkranz RR, Geller KS *et al.* HOP'N after-school project: an obesity prevention randomized controlled trial. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2010; **7**:90.
76. Elder JP, Crespo NC, Corder K *et al.* Childhood obesity prevention and control in city recreation centres and family homes: the MOVE/me Muevo Project. *Pediatr Obes* 2014; **9**:218-231.
77. Ezendam NP, Brug J, Oenema A. Evaluation of the Web-based computer-tailored FATaintPHAT intervention to promote energy balance among adolescents: results from a school cluster randomized trial. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2012; **166**:248-255.
78. Faith MS, Berman N, Heo M *et al.* Effects of contingent television on physical activity and television viewing in obese children. *Pediatrics* 2001; **107**:1043-1048.
79. Fitzgibbon ML, Stolley MR, Schiffer L, Van HL, KauferChristoffel K, Dyer A. Two-year follow-up results for Hip-Hop to Health Jr.: a randomized controlled trial for overweight prevention in preschool minority children. *J Pediatr* 2005; **146**:618-625.
80. Fitzgibbon ML, Stolley MR, Schiffer L, Van HL, KauferChristoffel K, Dyer A. Hip-Hop to Health Jr. for Latino preschool children. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2006; **14**:1616-1625.
81. Fitzgibbon ML, Stolley MR, Schiffer LA *et al.* Hip-Hop to Health Jr. Obesity Prevention Effectiveness Trial: postintervention results. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2011; **19**:994-1003.
82. Fitzgibbon ML, Stolley MR, Schiffer L *et al.* Family-based hip-hop to health: outcome results. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2013; **21**:274-283.
83. French SA, Gerlach AF, Mitchell NR, Hannan PJ, Welsh EM. Household obesity prevention: Take Action--a group-randomized trial. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2011; **19**:2082-2088.

84. Gentile DA, Welk G, Eisenmann JC *et al.* Evaluation of a multiple ecological level child obesity prevention program: Switch what you Do, View, and Chew. *BMC Med* 2009;**7**: 49.
85. Grydeland M, Bjelland M, Anderssen SA *et al.* Effects of a 20-month cluster randomised controlled school-based intervention trial on BMI of school-aged boys and girls: the HEIA study. *Br J Sports Med* 2014; **48**:768-773.
86. Habib-Mourad C, Ghandour LA, Moore HJ *et al.* Promoting healthy eating and physical activity among school children: findings from Health-E-PALS, the first pilot intervention from Lebanon. *BMC Public Health* 2014; **14**:940.
87. Harrison M, Burns CF, McGuinness M, Heslin J, Murphy NM. Influence of a health education intervention on physical activity and screen time in primary school children: 'Switch Off--Get Active'. *J Sci Med Sport* 2006; **9**:388-394.
88. Hughes AR, Stewart L, Chapple J *et al.* Randomized, controlled trial of a best-practice individualized behavioral program for treatment of childhood overweight: Scottish Childhood Overweight Treatment Trial (SCOTT). *Pediatrics* 2008; **121**:e539-e546.
89. Kipping RR, Payne C, Lawlor DA. Randomised controlled trial adapting US school obesity prevention to England. *Arch Dis Child* 2008; **93**:469-473.
90. Kipping RR, Howe LD, Jago R *et al.* Effect of intervention aimed at increasing physical activity, reducing sedentary behaviour, and increasing fruit and vegetable consumption in children: active for Life Year 5 (AFLY5) school based cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2014; **348**:g3256.
91. Lubans DR, Morgan PJ, Okely AD *et al.* Preventing Obesity Among Adolescent Girls: One-Year Outcomes of the Nutrition and Enjoyable Activity for Teen Girls (NEAT Girls) Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2012; **166**:821-827.
92. Martinez-Andrade GO, Cespedes EM, Rifas-Shiman SL *et al.* Feasibility and impact of Creciendo Sanos, a clinic-based pilot intervention to prevent obesity among preschool children in Mexico City. *BMC Pediatr* 2014; **14**:77.
93. McCallum Z, Wake M, Gerner B *et al.* Outcome data from the LEAP (Live, Eat and Play) trial: a randomized controlled trial of a primary care intervention for childhood overweight/mild obesity. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2007; **31**:630-636.
94. Neumark-Sztainer DR, Friend SE, Flattum CF *et al.* New moves-preventing weight-related problems in adolescent girls a group-randomized study. *Am J Prev Med* 2010; **39**:421-332.
95. Ni Mhurchu C, Roberts V, Maddison R *et al.* Effect of electronic time monitors on children's television watching: pilot trial of a home-based intervention. *Prev Med* 2009; **49**:413-417.
96. O'Connor TM, Hilmer A, Watson K, Baranowski T, Giardino AP. Feasibility of an obesity intervention for paediatric primary care targeting parenting and children: Helping HAND. *Child Care Health Dev* 2013; **39**:141-149.

97. Ostbye T, Krause KM, Stroo M *et al.* Parent-focused change to prevent obesity in preschoolers: results from the KAN-DO study. *Prev Med* 2012; **55**:188-195.
98. Patrick K, Norman GJ, Davila EP *et al.* Outcomes of a 12-month technology-based intervention to promote weight loss in adolescents at risk for type 2 diabetes. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2013; **7**:759-770.
99. Pbert L, Druker S, Gapinski MA *et al.* A school nurse-delivered intervention for overweight and obese adolescents. *J Sch Health* 2013; **83**:182-193.
100. Peralta LR, Jones RA, Okely AD. Promoting healthy lifestyles among adolescent boys: the Fitness Improvement and Lifestyle Awareness Program RCT. *Prev Med* 2009; **48**:537-542.
101. Puder JJ, Marques-Vidal P, Schindler C, Zahner L *et al.* Effect of multidimensional lifestyle intervention on fitness and adiposity in predominantly migrant preschool children (Ballabeina): cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2011; **343**:d6195.
102. Reilly JJ, Kelly L, Montgomery C *et al.* Physical activity to prevent obesity in young children: cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2006; **333**:1041.
103. Robinson TN, Killen JD, Kraemer HC *et al.* Dance and reducing television viewing to prevent weight gain in African-American girls: the Stanford GEMS pilot study. *Ethn Dis* 2003; **13**:S65-S77.
104. Robinson TN, Matheson DM, Kraemer HC *et al.* A randomized controlled trial of culturally tailored dance and reducing screen time to prevent weight gain in low-income African American girls: Stanford GEMS. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2010; **164**:995-1004.
105. Roemmich JN, Gurgol CM, Epstein LH. Open-loop feedback increases physical activity of youth. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2004; **36**:668-673.
106. Singh AS, Chin APM, Brug J, van MW. Dutch obesity intervention in teenagers: effectiveness of a school-based program on body composition and behavior. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2009; **163**:309-317.
107. Smith JJ, Morgan PJ, Plotnikoff RC *et al.* Smart-phone obesity prevention trial for adolescent boys in low-income communities: the ATLAS RCT. *Pediatrics* 2014; **134**:e723-e731.
108. Spruijt-Metz D, Nguyen-Michel ST, Goran MI, Chou CP, Huang TT. Reducing sedentary behavior in minority girls via a theory-based, tailored classroom media intervention. *Int J Pediatr Obes* 2008; **3**:240-8.
109. Taveras EM, Blackburn K, Gillman MW *et al.* First steps for mommy and me: a pilot intervention to improve nutrition and physical activity behaviors of postpartum mothers and their infants. *Matern Child Health J* 2011; **15**:1217-1227.
110. Taveras EM, Gortmaker SL, Hohman KH *et al.* Randomized controlled trial to improve primary care to prevent and manage childhood obesity: the High Five for Kids study. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2011; **165**:714-722.

111. Todd MK, Reis-Bergan MJ, Sidman CL, Flohr JA, Jameson-Walker K, Spicer-Bartolau T, Wildeman K. Effect of a family-based intervention on electronic media use and body composition among boys aged 8--11 years: a pilot study. *J Child Health Care* 2008; **12**:344-358.
112. Toruner EK, Savaser S. A controlled evaluation of a school-based obesity prevention in Turkish school children. *J Sch Nurs* 2010; **26**:473-482.
113. van Nassau F, Singh AS, Cerin E *et al.* The Dutch Obesity Intervention in Teenagers (DOiT) cluster controlled implementation trial: intervention effects and mediators and moderators of adiposity and energy balance-related behaviours. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2014; **11**:158.
114. van Grieken A, Veldhuis L, Renders CM *et al.* Population-based childhood overweight prevention: outcomes of the 'Be active, eat right' study. *PLoS One* 2013; **8**:e65376.
115. Wafa SW, Talib RA, Hamzaid NH *et al.* Randomized controlled trial of a good practice approach to treatment of childhood obesity in Malaysia: Malaysian Childhood Obesity Treatment Trial (MASCOT). *Int J Pediatr Obes* 2011; **6**:e62-e69.
116. Williamson DA, Champagne CM, Harsha DW *et al.* Effect of an environmental school-based obesity prevention program on changes in body fat and body weight: a randomized trial. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2012 August; **20**:1653-1661.